EXHIBIT 8

	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
2	
3	******************
4	IN RE: VIOXX PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION
5	MDL DOCKET NO. 1657 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA
6	APRIL 27, 2006, 1:00 P.M.
7	*****************
8	EDANGODIDE OF DOCUMENTAGE
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	APPEARANCES:
13	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: HERMAN HERMAN KATZ & COTLAR BY: RUSS M. HERMAN, ESQUIRE
14	201 ST. CHARLES AVENUE, SUITE 4310 NEW ORLEANS, LA 70170
15	
16	BEASLEY ALLEN CROW METHVIN PORTIS & MILES
17	BY: ANDY D. BIRCHFELD, JR., ESQUIRE 234 COMMERCE STREET
18	POST OFFICE BOX 4160 MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA 36103
19	,
FOR THE DEFENDANT: STONE PIGMAN WALTHER WITTMANN	FOR THE DEFENDANT: STONE PIGMAN WALTHER WITTMANN BY: PHILLIP A. WITTMANN, ESQ.
21	546 CARONDELET STREET NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130-3588
22	INDIW OICHDAINS, HA /0130 3300
23	BARTLIT BECK HERMAN PALENCHAR & SCOTT
	BY: PHILIP S. BECK, ESQUIRE
24	BY: ANDY GOLDMAN, ESQUIRE 54 W. HUBBARD STREET, SUITE 300
25	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60601

Ī	
1	ALSO PRESENT:
2	GERALD MEUNIER, ESQUIRE
3	DAWN BARRIOS, ESQUIRE DREW RANIER, ESQUIRE
4	GRANT KAISER, ESQUIRE
5	MARK ROBINSON, ESQUIRE
6	EBEN FLASTER, ESQUIRE DOUG MARVIN, ESQUIRE
7	P. LEIGH O'DELL, ESQUIRE
8	TED WACKER, ESQUIRE ED BLIZZARD, ESQUIRE
9	SCOTT NABERS, ESQUIRE TOM KLINE, ESQUIRE
10	TOM KILLINE, EDGOTKE
11	MIKAL WATTS, ESQUIRE PETE KAUFMAN, ESQUIRE
12	ADAM HOEFLICH, ESQUIRE
13	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: CATHY PEPPER, CCR, RPR, CRR
14	500 POYDRAS STREET, ROOM B406 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70130
15	(504) 589-7779
16	
17	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY. TRANSCRIPT
18	PRODUCED BY COMPUTER.
19	
20	
21	
22	
24	
25	
20	

questions or show any documents they want to. What we're saying
is that we -- that if we're not allowed even to talk to these
physicians before the deposition, and they are, the reason --

4

02:19PM

02:19PM

02:19PM

02:19PM

02:19PM

02:19PM 10

02:19PM 11

02:19РМ 12

02:19РМ 13

02:19PM 14

02:19РМ 15

02:20PM 16

02:20PM 17

02:20PM 18

02:20PM 19

02:20PM 20

02:20PM 21

02:20PM 22

02:20PM 23

02:20PM 24

02:20РМ 25

THE COURT: I got it. I understand the issue. Look, that's precisely it. There is no question that the plaintiffs have the burden of dealing with the learned intermediary so you have to ask though questions. That's a key thing.

The issue is, whether you workshop the guy beforehand.

Now, the reason I've allowed the plaintiffs to talk to the treating physicians because that's the treating physician. I've excluded the defendants from talking to the treating physicians. And I think the defendant is right, from the standpoint of

talking with him. If you talk with him, the whole purpose of talking with him is to ask him about private matters about your client and not to expose them or give them one-sided presentations about the other side.

If it's not that way, I would have to open it up to the defendant to talk with them. They ought to be able to do the same thing, and I don't feel they ought to do the same thing because it's a private physician.

I think you've got a right to talk to your private physicians. The concern that I have is sending them material that is outside of the realm of the record of the private person. I don't have any problem with you're asking the questions. Now, the only other way I can do it is to allow the defendants to talk

1 to the physicians but to not ask them questions in their private
02:20PM 2 discussions about the plaintiffs, and that's not going to work
02:21PM 3 too well.

4

02:21PM

02:21PM

02:21PM

02:21PM

02:21PM

02:21PM

02:21PM 10

02:21PM 11

02:21PM 12

02:21PM 13

02:21PM 14

02:21PM 15

02:21PM 16

02:21PM 17

02:22PM 18

02:22PM 19

02:22PM 20

02:22PM 21

02:22PM 22

02:22PM 23

02:22PM 24

02:22PM 25

It just seems to me that you ought to have a right to talk to physicians by themselves about your client, but I'm concerned about the fairness of talking to the physicians and preventing the defendants from talking to the physicians and letting you go into other things. It just doesn't seem reasonable to me.

MR. HERMAN: I understand your comments, Your Honor. I have another view, another point of vantage. These physicians have been contacted 330 times by Merck. They've gotten one side of the story. They are fully prepared by Merck to go into a deposition. They are invited to Merck conferences, free conferences at hotels. They are wined and dined. They are sent all the Merck information long before our clients die or suffer a stroke. And they are very defensive, too.

After all, we are plaintiff lawyers. Half of them, when we go see them, believe that they are targets in a malpractice suit. All we're doing is balancing the field, saying, Look, you were contacted by Merck 330 times, your wife is a Merck representative, and you prescribed this. What those eight jurors want to know is if you had had the full story at the time you prescribed, would you have prescribed it, and that's the key questions all these jurors want to know and they know it.